

Some things of weighty concernment Proposed in  
 Meeknes and love by way of Queries to the  
 serious consideration of the inhabitants of Aber-  
 deen, which also may be of use to such as are of  
 the same mind with them, else where in this  
 Nation.

Added by way of Appendix to a Book intituled

# TRUTH CLEARED OF CALUMNIES.

## Question 1.

**W**HETHER it be a thing any wise warrantable in common equity, or  
 true Christianity, for any person, or persons, to take liberty, both  
 in Pulpit, and print, to speak against a people as dangerous, and  
 Heretical, and yet wholly to debar that people from vindicating  
 themselves, in either of these wayes, so far as they can? Or whe-  
 ther it can be supposed, that any persons, except they wholly give up them-  
 selves implicitly, to beleive the accusers can make a true Judgement, in that  
 case, upon the accused, especially considering that maxime of law, *Quisquis  
 inaudita altera parte, &c.* i. e. Hee that without hearing both parties pronounce  
 cath judgement, though hee decide the right upon the matter, hath not done  
 the part of a just Judge, to which ad the consideration of these passages of Scrip-  
 ture. 1. Thess. 4. 21. Prov. 18. 13. Ilayah 41. 21.

Qu. 2. Whether then it was not contrary to the laws both divine, and hu-  
 mane, for the Priests in Aberdeen, to importune the Magistrate to make search  
 for that Booke lately published in vindication of the people called Quakers?  
 Or whether such a practice hath any warrant, except what flows originally  
 from the Spanish Inquisition, as being directly contrary to equity; and to the  
 Scriptures above mentioned?

Qu. 3. Whether also it was not both Antiscriptural and Popish in C. M.  
 to prohibit his hearers from reading of that Booke, by censuring it with  
 Payson? Whether that was not to keep people in darkness, and dependence  
 upon him? or with how little reason could he desire such a thing, considering  
 hee asserted it to contain, an ample Confession, of all those Errors that had  
 gotten them with? And if so, whether it be likely, that it could prove dangerous

the *Arrows* being too great and monstrous, which by him, and his *Andrew*, are charged upon that people; that their confessing them, would rather scare people, then engage any to like them.

Qu. 4. And whether M. M. has bidding people abstain from that Book as poison, without tryall of what is in it, be not like unto the *Papist* way, who bid their neighbours abstaine from the *Protestants* books as poison? and whether may not even poison be tryed (though not by eating it) in a way that is not hazardous to the tryer, especially seeing that which some may call poison, may be afterward found by sound tryall, to be good and wholesome food, yea *Medicines* to expell such poisonous *Dissimulations*, as your *Papists* infuse into people?

Qu. 5. And seeing G. M. bids his hearers abstain from the *Quakers* words as from poison, doth hee not endanger such to be poisoned, whom hee sends, or allows to come to our meetings, to hear what is spoke? and what knoweth G. M. but his spies, may be touched, so that it may be said, as it was then, *is Saul also among the Prophets?*

Qu. 6. And seeing G. M. counts our words as poison; why doth hee bring them forth so much among his hearers, if hee thinks hee gives strong *Antidotes* against them, I have heard some of his own hearers say; that, that which hee calls the poison, wrought more effectually to persuade, even out of his mouth, then all his *Antidotes* could doe to diswade?

Qu. 7. Whether the latter part of that Allegance of G. M. (viz. that all they had charged on the *Quakers*, was confessed to, in that book) be not a manifest *Arrogance*, in respect the greatest charges alledged by him, against the *Quakers*, are therein utterly denied. As for instance, the matter of *Religionism* in page 24. the matter of *Papery* in page 34. and of *Arminianisme* pag. 64. &c.

Qu. 8. Whether the said G. M. hath not manifested very much deceit, in saying also publicly, that the said book asserts it, not only to be a thing easy, but pleasant for wicked people, to keep holy the *Sabbath day*, and to perform the spirituall duties commanded to be performed thereon, unless hee understands them to be, simply the dispensing to hear a man talke an hour or two, and to have all the rest of the day to spend in idleness, vain communication, and frolicking at the alehouse, &c. Which are the words mentioned page 72.

Qu. 9. Whether it be any way unfitable to the law of *Charity*, or to the meek *Spirit* of *Christ*, to use plain, and downright dealing calling a *Li* a *Li*? or whether any be to be blamed, for so doing, considering the praise of all the *Prophets*, and of *Christ* and of his *Apostles*, how sharply they dealt with false teachers as may appear by these Scriptures? *Isai* 56. 1. *Lev* 23. to *Verf* 33. *Ezek* 34. *Hos* 4. from 6. to 10. *ibid* 5. 1. *Mich* 3. 5. *Mat* 23. *Joh* 8.

Qu. 10. Whether then they be not prejudiced, who accuse the *Quakers* for using the same terms; seeing they are willing to make the application manifest; by comparing the fruits of the present pretended Preachers, with those that were of old? As for instance, whether it be a breach either of morall civility, or *Christian* meeknes to say, *John Mungie* lived in assisting *Robert Barclay* to have been educated in a *Jesuits* Colledge, seeing it is utterly false?

Qu. 11. And whether *David Lyall*, may not be judged more guilty of *Irreligion* than



Qu. 16. Whether it can then pertinently be objected as a token of pride against the *Quakers*, that they preach *Repentance* especially against their doing it without study, or premeditation, as if trusting to the Spirit of God for utterance were pride, which is expressly allowed commanded, and practised in the *Script.* *Luc. 21. 14, 15.* *Acts 2. 4.* *1. Cor. 2. 14.* and *1. Cor. 14. 29.* *1. Pet. 4. 11.*

Qu. 17. Whether that doth not homologate the *Papish* argument for a *Liturgie* alledging it to be pride for men to address themselves in *Prayers* framed *Ex tempore*, seeing there are *Prayers* framed by the *Church*, and by *learned men*, heretofore (as they say) better then privat men can make off hand, containing what ever is applicable to the condition of any Soule? Or whether it may not by the same argument be pressed upon *David Lyall*, as a point of pride, for him, or his Brethren, to use any *Prayer*, except that exemplar, left by *Christ*, commonly called the *Lords Prayer*, seeing they themselves make the extent of it so large, as ther can be no condition of any particular person, which they will not reduce to some of the heads of it, and that enlargements, and *Tautologies* to God, are not only vain, and needles, but also by himselfe prohibited?

Qu. 18. And whether it favours more of pride, to preach without premeditation which is but a speaking unto man, then to pray without premeditation, which is a speaking unto God? And seeing *David Lyall* and his Brethren pray *ex tempore*, and without premeditation, of any conceived forme of prayer, may it not be laid at his and their door, first to clear themselves of pride, as to this matter, especially when they do not pretend to pray by the immediate teaching and leading of the spirit, in which the only true *Prayer* is framed, that is acceptable unto God?

Qu. 19. Whether or not it did not as well expresse a mind filled with *Pride* as containe a manifest impertinency, for the same *David Lyall* to alledge as a token of the *Quakers* pride, that a little black fellow came into the Church (such were his expressions) whether these words I say favour not as little of *Humility*, as the thing it selfe is void of *Reason*, that either *littleness of bodie*, *blackness of feature*, or *beaumes of outward Exura* (for so I think hee means by fellow) are inconsistent with the esse, or being of a *Pride*, which if they had its probable himselfe could hardly have beene admitted to be one?

Qu. 20. Whether if such words and expressions be the fruits of premeditation and study, (which these men cry up so much, and judge so needfull) it deserves that esteeme they would have put upon it, or upon themselves because thereof; especially considering many more impertinencies, and ineffectuallities used by them, in their *Prayers*, witness that one mentioned upon the same occasion, by the aforesaid *D. L.* to wit that its better to be an humble Devil, then a proud fellow, which if used by a school-boy, would have deserved hissing, if not whips, as being *Reprehensibile in adjecto*.

See *David Lyall*, *George Meldrum*, *John Menzies*, three *Priests* in *Aberdeen*, who have lately most appeared in *Pulpit* against them called *Quakers*, and among other fellow *priests* are here in most concerned, answer these *Queries*, if they can, without using those shifts, and surreptitious, which the *Papists* used against the *Primitive Reformers*.